Case 1:17-cr-00047-DLC Document 43 Filed 02/23/17 Page 1 of 15

H273THIC UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 17 CR 47 (DLC) V. 5 MAHMOUD THIAM, 6 Defendant. 7 ----x 8 New York, N.Y. February 7, 2017 9 4:00 p.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. DENISE COTE, 12 District Judge 13 14 **APPEARANCES** 15 PREET BHARARA United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 16 ELISHA KOBRE 17 Assistant United States Attorney -and-18 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE BY: LORINDA LARYEA 19 SULLIVAN & WORCESTER LLP 20 Attorneys for Defendant BY: PAUL E. SUMMIT 21 ANDREW SOLOMON 22 ALSO PRESENT: Special Agent Stephanie Krug, FBI Paralegal Specialist Alexander Beer 23 24 25

THE DEPUTY CLERK: United States of America v. Mahmoud 1 Is the government ready to proceed? 2 Thiam. 3 MR. KOBRE: Yes, good afternoon, your Honor. Elisha Kobre for the government. With me at counsel table is FBI 4 5 Special Agent Stephanie Krug, trial attorney Lorinda Laryea of 6 the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and a 7 paralegal with our office, Alex Beer. 8 THE DEPUTY CLERK: For the defendant Thiam, are you 9 ready to proceed? 10 MR. SUMMIT: Yes, your Honor. Paul Summit for 11 defendant Thiam with Andrew Solomon of my office, Sullivan & 12 Worcester. 13 May I just start off by apologizing. I sincerely 14 apologize. I don't know what happened with regard to the 2 p.m. court date, but I apologize to the Court and to all 15 whose schedules were affected. 16 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 Mr. Kobre, this is my initial conference in this case. 19 I'll get an introduction to the case from you. 20 MR. KOBRE: Sure, your Honor. The defendant was 21 arrested on December 13 on a criminal complaint in this

district charging him with money laundering offenses.

And I can describe generally the factual background of

22

23

24

25

that if your Honor wants, but just to get to sort of what's happened procedurally since then, is that the defendant was

indicted by a grand jury on January 18, was arraigned before Magistrate Judge Francis on the 24th.

A large amount of discovery was produced to the defense this past Friday. I would say the bulk of the discovery, there are a few items outstanding. And the government believes we can produce the remaining discovery items not by this Friday but by next Friday, which would be the 17th of February. And I can give your Honor a little bit more background on what sort of is still outstanding.

THE COURT: Please.

MR. KOBRE: Let me just tell your Honor what the nature of the discovery is in this case and what's been produced so far.

So, there's, among other things, your Honor, the defendant made an extensive post-arrest statement which was videotaped and was also subsequently transcribed. There were also several search warrants that were executed. In particular, there were three search warrants for various e-mail accounts associated with the case, and then there was a search warrant executed at the defendant's residence. And this goes to sort of what has not yet been produced.

During the course of that search, among other things, there were obviously documents and records were seized, but numerous electronic devices have been seized, were seized as well. Those are in the process, as quickly as we can, of

getting those imaged and being able to turn them over to defense counsel. It is quite a bit of electronic discovery, your Honor.

So what's been produced so far are all the search warrant materials, the post-arrest statement, and the e-mail accounts, as well as approximately 335,000 pages of documents which include bank records and other records pertaining to this case.

What's left from the government's perspective is the images of the electronic devices that were seized, and like I said, your Honor, we've asked defense counsel for a hard drive and we're going to be ready to produce that no later than a week from Friday. And then there are some additional records which were obtained by way of subpoena, some of them more recently. So we're gathering those final items together, but they're very small in comparison to what's already been produced. So we would just ask to have until the 17th to get all of those items out the door, at which point the government will have completed its discovery.

THE COURT: Thank you. If this case went to trial, how long would it take to try?

MR. KOBRE: I think approximately two weeks, your Honor.

THE COURT: What would be the principal sources of the government's evidence at trial?

MR. KOBRE: Yes, your Honor. So, the principal sources of the government's evidence would be the defendant's post-arrest statement which was videotaped, there would be witnesses from the Republic of Guinea who would testify about the defendant's conduct there as the Minister of Mines and promoting of an agreement granting valuable mining rights to a Chinese conglomerate. So there would be witnesses from abroad who the government would bring, there would be bank records, there would be the testimony of witnesses from various banks inside the United States, who would testify to misrepresentations made by the defendant in connection with the money laundering scheme. There would be e-mails and other records as well, including -- so, e-mails, I'm sorry, and as well bank records, some of which were obtained through the MLAT process.

So the principal source of the evidence in this case are bank records from Hong Kong where the defendant received bribe proceeds, and so that would be also a principal source of the evidence.

THE COURT: Briefly describe the charge factually. Not the legal basis for the charge, but the factual charge here.

MR. KOBRE: Yes, your Honor. So the defendant was -- who is a U.S. citizen, was the Minister of Mines of the Republic of Guinea in West Africa between 2009 and 2010.

During that period of time, among other things, the defendant promoted the award of very valuable mining rights in the Republic of Guinea to a Chinese conglomerate. Right around at the same time, the defendant opened a bank account in Hong Kong, made various misrepresentations in opening that account to conceal the fact that he was a minister, that he was a public official of the Republic in Guinea, and received into that Hong Kong bank account a total of about \$8.5 million. The defendant then proceeded to launder that money into the United States. And at various instances when he was bringing the money here to the United States, was questioned by various compliance personnel with banks here about the nature of the money that he was bringing here from Hong Kong, that he was wiring to the United States, and made misrepresentations in connection with that as well.

That's really sort of the first charge which is the 1957 charge.

In addition, the second count pertains more specifically to the defendant's use of some of those bribe proceeds from the Hong Kong account to purchase a \$3.75 million estate in Dutchess County. And in support of that, your Honor, there are various e-mails showing that the defendant essentially concealed the source of the -- concealed the source of the proceeds that were used to purchase this, by an agreement that he had with an associate of his, whereby the

Dutchess County estate would be purchased by a company based in Mozambique in exchange for the defendant wiring \$375,000 toward the purchase of the property.

THE COURT: Thank you. So, the defendant has been arraigned on the indictment and is in custody. We need to set a schedule for trial, and once we have a trial date, we'll set a schedule for motions that's appropriate.

I understand the discovery is voluminous. Have counsel for the government and the defendant discussed a schedule for trial?

MR. KOBRE: Your Honor, I had a very brief conversation with Mr. Summit. However, I understand Mr. Summit has a motion for your Honor regarding his representation, so our conversation didn't get that far. And that's really where we are.

THE COURT: Mr. Summit.

MR. SUMMIT: Thank you, your Honor. Yes, we intend to move to withdraw. We had hoped to get the motion on file before this initial status conference, but because of the misunderstanding in my schedule, I wasn't aware that it was on for today, and that's my own fault.

We haven't filed the motion yet. But the motion is based on two things, principally. First, we have expended already a tremendous amount in fees — I mean, in time that would be charged out. Mr. Thiam in good faith, I think,

thought he could raise a very substantial legal defense fund from friends and family and colleagues. And it has not happened. I don't think there was any bad faith at all, but it has not happened.

We are very substantially unpaid with absolutely no prospect of being further paid. And if your Honor wishes, I can provide all of the particulars.

THE COURT: Are you representing to me that your client is indigent?

MR. SUMMIT: Yes.

THE COURT: And entitled to CJA funds?

MR. SUMMIT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, I understand there was a bail proceeding before a colleague of mine in my absence. And I haven't read the transcript, but it's available to me to read. So, you think your client in good faith can sign an affidavit that would qualify him under the Criminal Justice Act?

MR. SUMMIT: Yes, I do, your Honor. Yes, I do.

THE COURT: When I read the transcript, there will be nothing inconsistent?

MR. SUMMIT: There will be, respectfully, speculation on the government's part as to the possibility of hidden assets. There will not be facts about hidden assets nor, in my view, a reality, so far as I know, about hidden assets, your Honor.

I believe that this man is deeply in debt and we have set forth a lot of these debts. His children — the family owes enormous amounts to two private schools, and the children — he has three children living here in New York City — are on the verge of being thrown out of those private schools.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. He's paying tuition to private schools?

MR. SUMMIT: He used to pay tuition to private schools. He's wildly in arrears on the tuition. He is on the verge of being thrown out of an apartment, and there are eviction proceedings against his family. He owes 8 or \$9 million to the Internal Revenue Service, about a million dollars to New York State.

This is a family situation on the verge of catastrophe. And I do believe that if there were hidden assets, they would be invoked to prevent those catastrophes.

And your Honor, you're absolutely right, your Honor, there is a lengthy transcript about this. And I would welcome the Court's attention to it. I think the Court will conclude that Mr. Thiam can in good faith submit such an affidavit.

THE COURT: And your other ground? I think you said there were two.

MR. SUMMIT: Yes, I have a tax evasion trial in Boston starting in late March, and this is a jail case. I know your

Honor wishes to move it rapidly. Mr. Thiam I'm sure wishes to move it rapidly. And I must turn my attention to that trial. It's in Federal District Court in Boston.

THE COURT: Excuse me just one minute. My deputy has handed me the pretrial services report for the defendant. Let me look at that.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Thank you. I've had a chance to review it. I appreciate that opportunity.

So, frankly, Mr. Summit, as I expect you would suggest to me, whether or not you had this other trial commitment, given the volume of discovery and the seriousness of the charges, you would be wanting some time to prepare for trial anyway. But I understand the real here issue here is whether or not, because your bills won't be paid and the defendant is indigent and able to qualify under CJA, at least as you understand it, I should appoint CJA counsel to represent him and relieve you of the representation.

Obviously, it is inefficient to do all of this in stages, which I know you're acknowledging that you wish you had made your motion earlier so we could deal with this all efficiently.

MR. SUMMIT: Yes.

THE COURT: But I need the defendant to fill out and swear to a financial affidavit to qualify him for CJA funds.

There are obligations that he would assume under the law for false statements and obligations to pay back the CJA funds that might be expended on his behalf in this defense.

Given the history here and what I'm hearing and the fact that he retained you and you accepted his him as a client, I just want to make sure that I get a thoughtful CJA affidavit executed before I consider your application.

MR. SUMMIT: Absolutely, your Honor. I will work with him on that tomorrow.

THE COURT: Okay. So we'll put this matter over. And at the next conference then later this week, I'll decide whether or not to relieve you as counsel, and appoint CJA counsel, if that's appropriate, and schedule a trial date. So you should come prepared with your calendar just in case I don't relieve you, because we will set a trial date.

MR. SUMMIT: Thank you, your Honor. Would your Honor care to have a written motion in any event or simply the CJA application or affidavit?

THE COURT: I don't need a written motion. I don't normally get them from counsel. I'm happy to have one if you want to submit one.

MR. SUMMIT: Okay.

THE COURT: But I do need the affidavit carefully with advice from counsel filled out so that the defendant understands that these statements, which will be made under

oath, carry weight and will not be taken lightly.

MR. SUMMIT: Your Honor, there is an allegation in the indictment that Mr. Thiam received a large sum of money in Hong Kong. And he apparently made statements, I haven't reviewed yet the statements that he made. But I believe from the government's representations that he was questioned about that money in Hong Kong and made representations about it.

I think -- I would be reluctant to see him make any representations in an affidavit about that money, which is long gone apparently, with regard to whether it was a loan or a gift or what it was. If your Honor follows what I'm saying. On the other hand, I don't want the affidavit to be incomplete.

I guess what I'm suggesting is there may be one section that has to be in camera so that so he's not taking a position with regard to a trial issue at a time when we haven't even reviewed the tape of his interview.

THE COURT: Well, I haven't thought about this issue before. It seems to me, and I'm just seeking to give guidance to counsel so that you can decide whether or not you wish to find legal authority and argue this point to me. In the first instance, the affidavit is a statement to the Court, and it must be filled out or counsel will not be appointed to represent him. These funds are only available to someone who can't otherwise afford counsel.

The issue of the government access to the affidavit

and the information is a separate issue, I think. And the timing of that theoretically could be post-trial, if there is going to be a trial. There might be a disposition. Post a plea or a trial. And if the defendant chose to go to trial and was acquitted, it may never be needed to be unsealed. The government could make an application.

But, at some point the government's going to have access to this, because if there is a false statement, it's going to be made under oath, and the government would have an opportunity to investigate, and the Court has an obligation in monitoring these funds and making decisions about proper use of CJA funds, which is taxpayer money, and allocated for these important purposes, to make sure there aren't false statements.

So I suggest, Mr. Summit, that you and Mr. Kobre discuss this issue and see if you can work something out with respect to the process for filling out the affidavit.

Today is Tuesday, so let's look at Thursday, Ms. Rojas.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: 3:30 p.m. Thursday, February 9, at 3:30.

MR. SUMMIT: And may I say, your Honor, I'm optimistic that Mr. Kobre and I can work this out. I'm hopeful. And may I also say that assuming the Court does grant my motion, we will provide any transitional assistance to the CJA counsel that we can. Absolutely.

THE COURT: Good. And if I don't grant it, come 1 2 prepared to talk about a trial date. 3 MR. SUMMIT: Yes. THE COURT: Good. Let's talk about exclusion of time. 4 5 Fill me in where we stand, Mr. Kobre, on that. 6 MR. KOBRE: Yes, your Honor. So several days have 7 In particular between the date of the indictment, elapsed. which was the 18th, and the date of the arraignment which was 8 9 the 24th, time was not excluded. So that would be --10 THE COURT: Roughly six days. 11 MR. KOBRE: Correct, your Honor. And the government 12 would move under the Speedy Trial Act to exclude time between 13 today and Thursday, to allow defense time to sort out the 14 issues with representation, so that they can begin to review 15 the discovery and decide how to move forward on the case. THE COURT: Was time excluded then between the 24th 16 17 and today? 18 MR. KOBRE: It was, your Honor, and that was by Magistrate Judge Francis. 19 20 THE COURT: Any objection to an exclusion for two days 21 until February 9? 22 MR. SUMMIT: No objection, your Honor. 23

THE COURT: I make the exclusion pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(7)(A), finding the exclusion to be in the interest of justice and to outweigh the

24

25

Case 1:17-cr-00047-DLC Document 43 Filed 02/23/17 Page 15 of 15

H273THIC

best interests of the public and defendant in a speedy trial.

It's going to permit the representation issues to be resolved and put us in a better position on Thursday to set a schedule for this case.

Thank you all.

6 000